EXHIBIT A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
CHARLOTTESVILLE DIVISION

BABY DOE, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

-v.-

JOSHUA MAST, *et al.*,

Defendants,

and

UNITED SECRETARY OF STATE ANTONY BLINKEN, *et al.*

Nominal Defendants.

CIVIL NO: 3:22-cv-00049-NKM-JCH

PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT RICHARD MAST'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION TO PLAINTIFFS

Plaintiffs, by counsel, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b) serve these supplemental objections and responses to Defendant Richard Mast's First Set of Requests for the Production of Documents to Plaintiffs.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

These responses are made solely for the purpose of this action. These responses are subject to all objections as to competence, relevance, materiality, propriety, and admissibility, and to any and all other objections on any grounds that would require the exclusion of any statements contained therein if such request was asked of, or statements contained therein were made by, a witness present and testifying in court, all of which objections and grounds are expressly reserved and may be interposed at the time of trial.

Discovery in this matter and Plaintiffs' investigation of the subject matter of this action are ongoing. As such, Plaintiffs have not completed its discovery, investigation, research, and trial preparation. The following responses are based solely on the information that is presently available and specifically known to Plaintiffs. Accordingly, the following responses are given without prejudice to Plaintiffs' rights to produce evidence of any fact(s) which Plaintiffs may later discover or recall. Plaintiffs reserve the right to supplement the following responses and to change any and all answers therein as additional facts are ascertained, analyses are made, legal research is completed, contentions are made, or as a result of the Court's legal determination of issues.

Objections to each request are made on an individual basis below. From time to time, for special emphasis, Plaintiffs will repeat certain specific objections also set forth in the General Objections. The specific objections are submitted without prejudice to, and without waiving, the General Objections listed below but not expressly set forth in the response. The assertion of any objection to any request below is neither intended as, nor shall in any way be deemed, a waiver of Plaintiffs' rights to assert that or any other objection at a later date.

No incidental or implied admissions are intended by the response below. The fact that Plaintiffs have answered or objected to any request should not be taken as an admission that Plaintiffs accept or admit the existence of any "facts" or positions set forth or assumed by such request. The fact that Plaintiffs have answered part or all of any request is not intended to be, and shall not be construed to be, a waiver by Plaintiffs of any part of any objection to the request.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Plaintiffs' responses below do not in any way constitute an adoption of Defendant's purported Definitions of words or phrases contained in the Requests for Production. Plaintiffs object to the Definitions to the extent they: are unclear, ambiguous, overly broad, or unduly burdensome; are inconsistent with the ordinary and customary meaning of the words or phrases they purport to define; seek to impose obligations different from, or in excess of, those created by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, or other applicable statutes, rules or orders; include assertions of purported fact that are inaccurate or are disputed by the parties to this action; and/or incorporate other purported Definitions that suffer from such defects. Consistent with applicable law, and without waiver or limitation of any of its general or specific objections, Plaintiffs have made a good faith effort to interpret the objectionable Definitions and terms in these Requests for Production.

Plaintiffs object to every Request for Production—including, but not limited to, the "Definitions" and "Instructions" set forth in the Requests for Production—to the extent each Request purports to impose requirements that are different from, or in addition to, those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, or other applicable statutes, rules or orders, as well as the agreed to scope of discovery as set forth in the Parties' Rule 26(f) report.

Plaintiffs object to every Request for Production to the extent each request purports to seek information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, and/or any other applicable restriction or privilege on discovery. Plaintiffs will not produce information protected by such privileges.

Plaintiffs object to every Request for Production to the extent each Request calls for information that is irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case.

Plaintiffs object to every Request for Production to the extent each Request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and seeks information that is beyond the scope of discovery under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, or other applicable statutes, rules or orders.

Plaintiffs object to every Request for Production to the extent each Request seeks information that is confidential or classified, or the divulgence of which risks placing third parties in danger, as contemplated by the court's Protective Orders.

Plaintiffs further object to Defendant's "Definitions" and "Instructions" as being overly broad, vague, and ambiguous and as seeking information irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case.

Plaintiffs object to the Instructions to the extent that they impose discovery obligations beyond those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, or other applicable statutes, rules or orders, as well as the agreed to scope of discovery as set forth in the Parties' Rule 26(f) report.

Plaintiffs further object to Defendant's definition of "Document" to the extent it covers things outside the possession, custody or control of Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs further object to this definition to the extent that it covers duplicates of documents.

Plaintiffs object to the defined terms "Captain Mast" and "Major Mast" to the extent they imply the actions of Defendant Joshua Mast as a private citizen were undertaken in his official capacity as an agent of the United States, Department of Defense, or United States Marine Corps.

Plaintiffs object to Defendant's instruction to "set forth the contents of [], the date of destruction [of], [and] the name of the Person who ordered or authorized such destruction" of any requested documents that have been destroyed to the extent such Plaintiffs do not possess such specific knowledge. Plaintiffs lived for years in an active warzone and were hurriedly evacuated from their home country. As a result, it is likely that some requested documents may have been destroyed without Plaintiffs' knowledge as to the particulars of such destruction. Plaintiffs will provide such information regarding any documents destroyed by themselves or at their direction.

Plaintiffs will also provide such information regarding documents destroyed by third parties without direction from Plaintiffs, to the extent such knowledge is available to Plaintiffs.

Plaintiffs object to the definition of "Communication" to the extent that it purports to impose discovery obligations beyond those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, or other applicable statutes, rules or orders, as well as the agreed to scope of discovery as set forth in the Parties' Rule 26(f) report.

Plaintiffs object to Defendant's instruction to "furnish information and Documents in Your possession, custody, or control, including information that is in the possession, custody, or control of Your employees, agents, investigators, consultants, representatives, attorneys (subject to any otherwise applicable privileges), assignors, or any other Person within Your control[]" to the extent such Request is prohibited by Protective Orders entered in this court, the Circuit Court Matter, the Adoption Matter, the J&DR Matter, or the Baby L. Matter. Plaintiffs further object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents produced by opposing parties in the above-referenced matters.

Plaintiffs object to Defendant's instruction that "All Documents that respond, in whole or in part, to any part or clause of any paragraph of these Requests shall be produced in their entirety, including attachments, cover letters, memoranda, appendices, and enclosures. Documents that in their original condition were stapled, clipped, or otherwise fastened together shall be produced in such form so as to preserve their family relationship[]" to the extent this prevents redactions for privilege or to prevent disclosure of personal identifying information as contemplated by the Protective Order entered in this court or any of the above-mentioned proceedings.

Plaintiffs object to every Request for Production to the extent each request seeks information that is already in Defendant's possession or that is equally available to Defendant from public sources.

Plaintiffs object to Defendant's defined time period of June 1, 2019 to present. This predates the date on which Baby Doe was orphaned by three months. Plaintiffs will interpret the relevant time period as beginning on September 6, 2019.

Plaintiffs object to every Request for Production to the extent each request seeks information that is outside Plaintiffs' possession, custody or control.

Plaintiffs object to Defendant's instruction to identify produce documents "identified so as to correspond to the Request to which they respond[.]" Documents will often be responsive to multiple Requests, and Defendant imposes an undue burden in excess of the Fed. R. Civ. P. in requiring Plaintiffs to identify to which of his 68 Requests each document is responsive.

Plaintiffs expressly incorporate each of the foregoing General Objections into each of the following specific individual responses to the requests as though fully set forth therein, even if not specifically referred to in such response.

I. REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

1. All Documents or Communications sent or received by "John Doe" (or anyone acting on his behalf), from August 20, 2021 to present, to or from any agent of the Federal Government, including but not limited to, the complete forensic copy of John Doe's cellular telephone, to include any translations or derivatives of the forensic copy which John Doe received back from the United States Government. (On information and belief, such telephone shall include but not limited to a Samsung Galaxy Serial # RF8K82XS7QP associated with telephone number +93-70-077-7442).

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the extent it seeks information that does not advance the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party, to the extent it seeks "any translations or derivatives of the forensic copy" of John Doe's personal cell phone. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for classified information, immigration information not directly related to this litigation, and/or information pertaining to ongoing law enforcement investigations. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications sent or received by . . . anyone acting on [John Doe's] behalf[.]" Plaintiffs object to the use of the term "agent" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and subject to multiple interpretations. Plaintiffs will interpret "agent" as "agents acting in a law enforcement capacity."

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce all nonprivileged, responsive communications in their possession, custody or control between John Doe and agents of the United States government acting in a law enforcement capacity related to the claims in this litigation, to the extent they exist.

2. **All Documents or Communications sent or received by "Jane Doe" (or anyone acting on her behalf), from August 20, 2021 to present, to or from any agent of the Federal Government, including but not limited to, the complete forensic copy of Jane Doe's cellular telephone, to include any translations or derivatives of the forensic copy]which Jane Doe received back from the United States Government. (On information and belief, such telephone shall include but not be limited to a telephone associated with telephone number +93-78-245-9513).**

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it seeks "any translations or derivatives of the forensic copy" of Jane Doe's personal cell phone. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for classified information, immigration information not directly related to this litigation, and/or information pertaining to ongoing law enforcement investigations. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications sent or received by . . . anyone acting on [John Doe's] behalf[.]" Plaintiffs object to the use of the term "agent" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and subject to multiple interpretations. Plaintiffs will interpret "agent" as "agents acting in a law enforcement capacity."

3. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce all nonprivileged, responsive communications within their possession, custody or control between Jane Doe and agents of the United States government acting in a law enforcement capacity related to the claims in this litigation, to the extent they exist. **All Documents or Communications between July 10, 2021 and present, relating to an intent by Jane Doe to harm herself or others.**

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents that would reveal the personal identifying information of third parties, and any documents including such information will be produced with such personal identifying information redacted. Plaintiffs object to this Request as assuming facts not in the record to the extent it implies that Jane Doe has had any intent to harm others.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce all nonprivileged Communications and Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

4. All Documents or Communications between July 10, 2021 and present, relating to any promise or condition(s) upon Jane Doe accompanying John Doe in leaving Afghanistan, including coming to America.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as assuming facts not in the record, namely that there were any "promis[es] or condition(s) upon Jane Doe accompanying John Doe in leaving Afghanistan[.]" Plaintiffs object to this request as vague, ambiguous, and open to multiple interpretations due to the wording of its final clause. Plaintiffs will interpret this Request as documents relating to any promises or conditions serving as conditions precedent to leave Afghanistan, with the clause "including coming to America" modifying "leaving Afghanistan." If this is not Defendant's intended meaning, Plaintiffs are available to meet and confer regarding the meaning of this Request.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce all nonprivileged Communications and Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

5. All Documents or Communications relating to bringing Baby Doe to Kabul for medical care, between February 2019, and August 30, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents that would reveal the personal identifying information of third parties, and any documents including such information will be produced with such personal identifying information redacted. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents preceding Baby Doe's birth.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce all nonprivileged Communications and Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

6. All Documents or Communications relating to medical care for Baby Doe, between February 2019, and August 30, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents that would reveal the personal identifying information of third parties, and any documents including such information will be produced with such personal identifying information redacted. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents preceding Baby Doe's birth.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce all nonprivileged Communications and Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

7. All Documents or Communications relating to Baby Doe's physical or medical symptoms, between February 2019, and August 30, 2021, including, but not limited to, discoloration, flushed face, twitching eyes, seizures, and/or shaking.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents that would reveal the personal identifying information of third parties, and any documents including such information will be produced with such personal identifying information redacted. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent that it assumes facts not in the record, namely that Baby Doe experienced the symptoms enumerated in the Request. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents preceding Baby Doe's birth.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce all nonprivileged Communications and Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

8. All Documents or Communications relating to or listing Plaintiff Jane Doe's age.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party in this litigation.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not provide any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, Jane Doe's age is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Plaintiffs will not provide any documents in response to this Request.

9. All Documents or Communications between September 2019 and the present relating to Jane Doe's Taskiras (plural), national identities, or birthdates/dates of birth.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product

doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party in this litigation.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not provide any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, Jane Doe's national identity or birthdate are not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Plaintiffs will not provide any documents in response to this Request.

10. All Documents or Communications between September 2019 and the present relating to Jane Doe's Taskira (singular), national identity, or birthdate/date of birth.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party in this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request as duplicative of Request No. 9.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not provide any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, Jane Doe's national identity or birthdate are not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Plaintiffs will not provide any documents in response to this Request.

11. All Documents or Communications February 27, 2020 to the present in which John Doe used the word "daughter" or equivalent in relation to Baby Doe, in Pashto, Dari, or English.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product

doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party in this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, ambiguous, and open to multiple interpretations. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications" in which John Doe uses a word or any equivalent to that word. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it assumes without evidence that the exact translation of the word "daughter" would be used by one with legal custody of an orphaned child according to Afghan law and custom. Such a relationship is customarily referred to in terms of permanent guardianship.

Plaintiffs cannot respond to this Request as drafted and invite Defendant to meet and confer to formulate a more targeted Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

12. All Documents or Communications February 27, 2020 to the present in which John Doe used the word "father" or equivalent describing his relationship to Baby Doe, in Pashto, Dari, or English.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party in this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, ambiguous, and open to multiple interpretations. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications" in which John Doe uses a word or any equivalent to that word. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it assumes without evidence that the exact translation of the word "father" would be used by one with legal custody of an orphaned child according to Afghan law and custom. Such a relationship is customarily referred to in terms of permanent guardianship.

Plaintiffs cannot respond to this Request as drafted and invite Defendant to meet and confer to formulate a more targeted Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

13. All Documents or Communications between Plaintiffs (or anyone acting on their behalf) and media or news organizations or reporters (whether located in the U.S. or outside the U.S.), including, but not limited to, The New York Times, Associated Press, Rozina Ali, Martha Mendoza, Juliet Linderman, and/or Claire Galofaro, relating to the Plaintiff's, or Defendant Richard Mast; Joshua Mast; Stephanie Mast; Kimberly Mottley; Ahmad Osmani; and/or Baby Doe.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party in this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information from third parties whose conduct does not form a nexus with the claims at issue.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not provide any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control between Plaintiffs and media or news organizations regarding Defendants or Baby Doe, to the extent such materials exist.

14. All Documents or Communications between Plaintiffs (or anyone acting on their behalf) and local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies, including, but not limited to, the Department of Justice, FBI, DHS, and NCIS, relating to the Plaintiffs, Defendant Richard Mast; Joshua Mast; Stephanie Mast; Kimberly Motley; Ahmad Osmani; and/or Baby Doe.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks classified information, immigration information not directly related to this litigation, and/or information pertaining to ongoing law enforcement investigations. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications between Plaintiffs (or anyone acting on their behalf)[.]"

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce all nonprivileged, responsive communications within their possession, custody or control between John and/or Jane Doe, on the one hand, and agents of the United States government acting in a law enforcement capacity, on the other hand, related to the claims in this litigation.

15. All Documents or Communications sent or received by Donna Welton relating to Major Joshua Mast from September 6, 2019 to present, including, but not limited to, the email Ms. Welton wrote in approximately December 2019 that then-Captain Mast was under investigation.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this

information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents or communications in their possession, custody, or control involving Donna Welton regarding Joshua Mast, to the extent such materials exist.

16. All Documents or Communications relating to the three letters received by Ms. Welton and signed by Sayed Anwar Sadat, then the acting Afghan Minister of Labor and Social Affairs, between December 1, 2019 and March 1, 2020, including but not limited to, any drafts prepared by, or with the assistance of, any agent of the U.S. government.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents or communications in their possession, custody, or control involving Donna Welton and Sayed Anwar Sadat between December 1, 2019, and March 1, 2020, to the extent such materials exist.

17. All Documents or Communications sent or received by Donna Welton relating to Baby Doe from September 6, 2019 to present.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case, as there is no dispute the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents or communications in their possession, custody, or control involving Donna Welton regarding Baby Doe, to the extent such materials exist.

18. All Documents or Communications sent or received by Kathryn Wyer relating to Baby Doe from September 6, 2019 to present.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product

doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents or communications in their possession, custody, or control involving Kathryn Wyer regarding Baby Doe.

19. All Documents or Communications sent or received by the then CJ-9 for U.S. Forces - Afghanistan (USFOR-A), LTC Rosemary Reed, relating to Major Joshua Mast from September 6, 2019 to present.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents or communications in their possession, custody, or control involving Rosemary Reed regarding Joshua Mast, to the extent such materials exist.

20. All Documents or Communications sent or received by the then CJ-9 for U.S. Forces - Afghanistan (USFOR-A), then LTC Rosemary Reed, relating to Baby Doe from September 6, 2019 to present.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents or communications in their possession, custody, or control involving Rosemary Reed regarding Baby Doe, to the extent such materials exist.

21. All Documents or Communications relating to Baby Doe, between September 6, 2019 and March 1, 2020, between or among the Plaintiffs or any U.S. government agent to any Person or entity, including but not limited to, any Person, agent or Entity of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (GIROA); its Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (MOLSA) and its Minister Sayeed Anwar Sadat; the Islamic Emirates of Afghanistan (also known as the Taliban) or International Committee of the Red Cross agent; including any requiring, recommending, or relating to a DNA test and/or other form of evidence evidencing a familial relationship to Baby Doe and any other Person, prior to the release of Baby Doe from U.S. government protection.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this

information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it assumes facts not in the record, namely that a DNA test would typically be required or recommended under the circumstances. Plaintiffs further object to this Request as protected by the deliberative process privilege, and as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation, as there is no dispute the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks personal identifying information regarding third parties in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court and in the cases identified in Defendant's definitions and instructions.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

22. All Documents or Communications relating to Baby Doe, between September 6, 2019, and March 1, 2020, between or among the Plaintiffs or any U.S. government agent and any employee or agent of the Islamic Emirates of Afghanistan (also known as the Taliban), including, but not limited to, negotiators at the Doha Peace Accords.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. The requested documents are irrelevant to the claims at issue, because there is no dispute that the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents and information regarding communications between third parties. Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague and ambiguous to the extent it does not specify whether the relevant parties were those employed by the enumerated entities during the timeframe of September 6, 2019 to March 1, 2020, or whether this Request is meant to include communications within this timeframe with parties who have been employed by those entities at any point in time, including before or after that time frame.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United

States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

23. All Documents or Communications relating to Baby Doe, between September 3, 2021, and the present, between or among the Plaintiffs or any U.S. government agent and any employee or agent of the Islamic Emirates of Afghanistan (also known as the Taliban).

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents and information regarding communications between third parties. Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague and ambiguous to the extent it does not specify whether the relevant parties were those employed by the enumerated entities during the timeframe of September 3, 2021, to present, or whether this Request is meant to include communications within this timeframe with parties who have been employed by those entities at any point in time, including former employees.

Plaintiffs cannot respond to this Request as drafted and invite Defendant to meet and confer to formulate a more targeted Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

24. All Documents or Communications between September 6, 2019 and March 1, 2020, from the Plaintiffs or any Afghan government agent to any U.S. government agent, requiring, recommending, or relating to a DNA test (including requests for the U.S. government to support or provide DNA testing and/or other form of evidence evidencing a familial relationship to Baby Doe prior to releasing Baby Doe to anyone claiming to be a relative of Baby Doe).

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case because there is no dispute that the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made the final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross.

Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks documents and information regarding communications between third parties. Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague and ambiguous to the extent it does not specify whether the relevant parties were those employed by the enumerated entities during the timeframe of September 6, 2019 to March 1, 2020, or whether this Request is meant to include communications within this timeframe with parties who have been employed by those entities at any point in time, including before or after that time frame. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for information protected by the deliberative process privilege.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

25. All Documents or Communications with any current or former, volunteer, employee or official of any advocacy, non-profit, relief or aid organization relating to Richard Mast, Joshua Mast, Stephanie Mast, Baby Doe or the Plaintiffs John Doe or Jane Doe.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it seeks "all Documents or Communications with any current or former, volunteer, employee or official of any advocacy, non-profit, relief or aid organization relating to … John Doe or Jane Doe."

Plaintiffs cannot respond to this Request as drafted and invite Defendant to meet and confer to formulate a more targeted Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents or communications in their possession, custody, or control involving non-profit, relief, or aid organizations relevant to the claims in this case, to the extent such materials exist.

26. All Documents or Communications with any current or former employee or official of any church, religious Entity, faith-based Entity, or other Entity related to a religious faith relating to Baby Doe.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it seeks "all Documents or Communications with any current or former employee or official of any…Entity related to a religious faith relating to Baby Doe."

Plaintiffs cannot respond to this Request as drafted and invite Defendant to meet and confer to formulate a more targeted Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents or communications in their possession, custody, or control involving church or religious-based entities regarding Baby Doe, to the extent such materials exist.

27. All Documents or Communications between September 6, 2019 and March 1, 2020 from any member of the Craig Joint Theatre Hospital staff regarding professional ethical obligations in relation to Baby Doe, including, but not limited to, the email from Brigadier General Norman West (then Colonel) indicating his ethical obligations to require a DNA test.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by deliberative process privilege. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it assumes facts not in the record, namely that Craig Joint Theatre Hospital staff were under an ethical obligation to perform DNA testing on Baby Doe prior to transferring them for family reunification.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control regarding Baby Doe's medical care, to the extent such materials exist.

28. All Documents or Communications relating to Bahlool Aqa (and alternate phonetic spelling including, but not limited to, "Bahlul," "Balul," "Balool" or "Aka," "Agha," or "Aga"), including but not limited to, the Tactical Interrogation Report(s) of the detainee from the objective of the 5-6 September 2019 mission that recovered Baby Doe from the battlefield.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case because there is no dispute that the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made the final determination to reunify

Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks classified information. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it is not limited in time. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information regarding the named individual not in connection with Baby Doe. Plaintiffs will limit their response to Documents or Communications relating to Bahlool Aqa in connection with Baby Doe.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

29. All Documents or Communications relating to how, when, or where Bahlool Aqa or any member of his immediate family were killed.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this

information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks classified information. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation to the extent is seeks information on the killings of "any member of [Bahlool Aqa]'s immediate family[.]"

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce nonprivileged documents responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

30. All Documents or Communications relating to the funeral or burial of Bahlool Aqa or any member of his immediate family.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation because there is no dispute that the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made the final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

31. All Documents or Communications relating to Baby Doe prior to September 6, 2019.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

32. All Documents or Communications sent or received by petitioner Aminullah Amin on September 6, 7, 8 or 9, 2019, including but not limited to, text messages, Facebook messenger, voice messages, emails, WhatsApp or other messaging applications, and call logs.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications" on a date range, irrespective of the contents of such Documents or Communications." Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it violated the court's Protective Order by not proceeding by pseudonyms.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

33. All Documents or Communications sent or received from John Doe or Jane Doe relating to the decision to leave Afghanistan between July 10, 2021 and September 3, 2021, including but not limited to any communication regarding progress of their travel, or ultimate or transit destinations such as the United Arab Emirates, Germany, Qatar, the United States, Mexico, or any other country other than Afghanistan.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation to the extent it seeks information concerning the status of their travel from Afghanistan to, ultimately, the United States.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce nonprivileged Documents and Communications within their possession, custody or control, to and from Plaintiffs regarding their decision to travel from Afghanistan to the United States at the direction of Defendants Joshua Mast and Kimberley Motley for the purposes of medical treatment for Baby Doe, to the extent such documents exist.

34. All call, text, WhatsApp or other messaging app logs for John Doe for July, September, and October 2019, and July, August and September 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of the case, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation to the extent the Request includes no limitations as to the subject matter of Communications.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request. Plaintiffs invite Defendant to meet and confer to formulate a more targeted Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce call, text, WhatsApp, or other messaging app messages from John Doe within their possession, custody, or control related to the claims in this litigation.

35. All Documents or Communications relating to Bahlool Aqa or his immediate family members from 1 July 2019 to present.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of the case, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation to the extent the Request includes no limitations as to the subject matter of Communications. Plaintiffs will interpret this Request to include only communications concerning Baby Doe. Plaintiffs' familial relationship to Baby Doe was determined by the government of Afghanistan in 2021 with family tracing assistance by the International Committee for the Red Cross, and Baby Doe's transfer to the government of Afghanistan for reunification with Plaintiffs' family was done pursuant to a final determination by the United States Government and is not at issue in this litigation. Thus, Plaintiffs' relationship to Balool Aqa is not at issue in this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks document preceding Baby Doe's birth.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide nonprivileged Documents within their possession, custody or control, responsive to this Request to the extent they relate to Baby Doe as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent such documents exist.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

36. All Documents or Communications relating to the location of Bahlool Aqa's house from September 6, 2019 to present.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for classified documents and information, or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs' familial relationship to Baby Doe was determined by the government of Afghanistan in 2021 with family tracing assistance by the International Committee for the Red Cross, and Baby Doe's transfer to the government of Afghanistan for reunification with Plaintiffs' family was done pursuant to a final determination by the United States Government and is not at issue in this litigation. Thus, Plaintiffs' relationship to Balool Aqa is not at issue in this litigation.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

37. All Documents or Communications relating to identification documents of Bahlool Aqa or member of his immediate family, including, but not limited to National Identity cards, birth certificates, passports, licenses, or identification of any sort.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs' familial relationship to Baby Doe was determined by the government of Afghanistan in 2021 with family tracing assistance by the International Committee for the Red Cross, and Baby Doe's transfer to the government of Afghanistan for reunification with Plaintiffs' family was done pursuant to a final determination by the United States Government and is not at issue in this litigation. Thus, Plaintiffs' relationship to Balool Aqa or any of his immediate family members is not at issue in this litigation.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

38. All photos or video of Bahlool Aqa's house or Sekzi village.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for classified documents and information, or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs' familial relationship to Baby Doe was determined by the government of Afghanistan in 2021 with family tracing assistance by the International Committee for the Red Cross, and Baby Doe's transfer to the government of Afghanistan for reunification with Plaintiffs' family was done pursuant to a final determination by the United States Government and is not at issue in this litigation. Thus, Plaintiffs' relationship to Balool Aqa is not at issue in this litigation.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

39. All photos of Bahlool Aqa or members of his immediate family.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation because there is no dispute that the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made the final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for classified documents and information, or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

40. All photos or video of Baby Doe prior to September 6, 2019.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation because there is no dispute the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for classified documents and information, or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

41. All Documents or Communications relating to John Doe being investigated for any reason, including, but not limited to, affiliations with a terrorist organization, between August 29, 2021 and December 8, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for classified documents and information, or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it purports to seek information concerning ongoing law enforcement investigations. Plaintiffs object on the grounds that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control. Plaintiffs further object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, disproportional to the needs of the case, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks information regarding investigations unrelated to John Doe's parental relationship to Baby Doe.

Plaintiffs state that they have no documents responsive to this Request.

42. All Documents or Communications sent or received by John Doe or Jane Doe regarding defendants Richard Mast, Joshua Mast, Stephanie Mast, Baby Doe., Ahmad Osmani, or Kimberly Motley, between 10 July 2021 and 3 September 2021, including, but not limited to, text messages, Facebook messenger, voice messages, emails, WhatsApp or other messaging applications, and call logs.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications" to the extent it seeks information regarding subject matter not pertaining to the events at issue in this litigation.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce nonprivileged Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications regarding the Defendants between July 10, 2021, and September 3, 2021, to the extent such materials exist.

43. All Documents or Communications sent or received by Plaintiffs between July 10, 2021 to present relating to permission for Jane Doe, John Doe or Baby Doe to leave Afghanistan or to travel to any location outside of Afghanistan from John Doe's father or the Taliban including any Documents or Communications which John Doe identifies as containing false statements.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications" and to the extent it seeks information regarding travel not pertaining to the events at issue in this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks information beyond the scope of demonstrating John and Jane Doe's mental state, intentions, and understanding of where, when, why, how, and for how long they would be traveling outside of Afghanistan.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce nonprivileged Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications regarding Plaintiffs' plans to leave Afghanistan between July 10, 2021, and September 3, 2021, to the extent such materials exist.

44. All Documents or Communications relating to seeking permission from any Person or Entity for Baby Doe and/or John Doe and Jane Doe to leave Afghanistan from July 10, 2021 to December 1, 2021, including, but not limited to, permission from Haji Mohammad Ismail or any other Person, council (elders, jirga, etc.), or Entity such as the Taliban or Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, or the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications" and to the extent it seeks information regarding travel not pertaining to the events at issue in this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks information beyond the scope of demonstrating John and Jane Doe's mental state, intentions, and understanding of where, when, why, how, and for how long they would be traveling outside of Afghanistan. Plaintiffs object to this Request as duplicative of Request No. 43.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce nonprivileged Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications regarding Plaintiffs' plans to leave Afghanistan between July 10, 2021, and September 3, 2021, to the extent such materials exist.

45. All Documents or Communications relating to *not* having received permission from any Person or Entity for Baby Doe and/or John Doe and Jane Doe to leave Afghanistan, including, but not limited to, *not* having received permission from: Haji Mohammad Ismail or any other Person, council (elders, jirga, etc.), or Entity such as the Taliban or Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, or the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications" and to the extent it seeks information regarding travel not pertaining to the events at issue in this litigation. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks information beyond the scope of demonstrating John and Jane Doe's mental state, intentions, and understanding of where, when, why, how, and for how long they would be traveling outside of Afghanistan. Plaintiffs object to this Request as duplicative of Request Nos. 43 and 44.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce nonprivileged Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications regarding Plaintiffs' plans to leave Afghanistan between July 10, 2021, and September 3, 2021, to the extent such materials exist.

46. All Documents or Communications with or relating to the American Coordination Cell, any agent or representative of the U.S. government, or any other foreign contact besides Defendants between July 10, 2021 and September 3, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, ambiguous, and open to multiple interpretations to the extent it refers to "foreign agents." Plaintiffs do not know what Defendant refers to as the "American Coordination Cell," and thus cannot respond with regard to this portion of the Request. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks "All Documents and Communications with or relating to…any agent or representative of the U.S. government" regardless of the subject matter of these Documents and Communications.

Plaintiffs cannot respond to this Request as drafted and invite Defendant to meet and confer to formulate a more targeted Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications with or regarding the "American Coordination Cell" or U.S. officials between July 10, 2021, and September 3, 2021, to the extent such materials exist.

47. All Documents or Communications relating to Plaintiffs or Baby Doe between September 3, 2021 and December 8, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, disproportional to the needs of the case, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks "all Documents or Communications relating to" themselves. By definition, all Communications to and from Plaintiffs will relate to themselves, and this Request must place a limitation on the subject matter.

Plaintiffs cannot respond to this Request as drafted and invite Defendant to meet and confer to formulate a more targeted Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications relevant to the claims in this litigation between September 3, 2021, and December 8, 2021, to the extent such materials exist.

48. All Documents or Communications relating to John Doe's father transferring physical custody of or control over Baby Doe to John Doe or Jane Doe.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce nonprivileged Documents within their possession, custody, or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

49. All Documents or Communications relating to John Doe's father transferring legal custody of or control over Baby Doe to John Doe or Jane Doe.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce nonprivileged Documents within their possession, custody, or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

50. All Documents or Communications relating to any Person or Entity granting John Doe's father physical custody or control over Baby Doe.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case because there is no dispute the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross The sufficiency and legal effect of these determinations are not at issue in this case.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

51. All Documents or Communications relating to any Person or Entity granting John Doe's father legal custody or control over Baby Doe.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case because there is no dispute the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. The sufficiency and legal effect of these determinations are not at issue in this case.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce non privileged Documents within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

52. All Documents or Communications relating to or in any way identifying Baby Doe's family members, including, but not limited to, her siblings.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks information regarding Baby Doe's siblings. Plaintiffs object to this

Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case, because there is no dispute the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. The sufficiency and legal effect of these determinations are not at issue in this case.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

53. All Documents or Communications relating to Martha Jenkins between September 3, 2021 and December 8, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks "all Documents and Communications relating to Martha Jenkins."

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will produce non privileged Documents within their possession, custody or control, authored or sent between September 3, 2021 and December 8, 2021 to and from Martha Jenkins concerning Baby Doe, to the extent such documents exist.

54. All Documents or Communications relating to a DNA test between September 6, 2019 and December 8, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks "All Documents or Communications related to *a DNA test*." Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case, because there is no dispute the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. The sufficiency and legal effect of these determinations are not at issue in this case.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United

States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

55. All Documents or Communications relating to DNA samples taken from John Doe or any other Person to compare with the DNA of Baby Doe.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks information regarding Baby Doe's siblings. Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case, because there is no dispute the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. The sufficiency and legal effect of these determinations are not at issue in this case. Plaintiffs further object to this Request as assuming facts not in the record, namely that laboratories or other entities accredited by the Association for the Advancement of Blood & Biotherapies exist that could produce DNA evidence for the blood relationship between John Doe and Baby Doe that would be deemed admissible in Virginia or Fourth Circuit courts.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

56. All Documents or Communications relating to the Taliban, Terik-i-Taliban, or any other armed group, fighting, conflict, or jihad of any sort between September 6, 2019 and September 3, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party, as this Request, as drafted, would encompass any reference to Afghanistan—an active warzone during the specified time period—or the United States military.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome, because it seeks "All documents and communications" Plaintiffs might possess regarding "fighting" and "conflict" over a two-year period not just in Afghanistan but anywhere in the world. In the context of the request, "fighting" and "conflict" are vague and ambiguous. Moreover, information regarding "the Taliban, Terik-i-Taliban, or any other armed group" is not relevant to any claim or defense in this litigation.

57. All Documents or Communications relating to weapons or explosives use and John Doe in 2014 or any other year or John Doe's presence in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas in 2020 or any other year.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, ambiguous, and open to multiple interpretations to the extent it refers to "weapons or explosives use and John Doe[.]" Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks information as to John Doe's physical whereabouts "in 2020 or any other year." Plaintiffs presume that Defendant is referring to the Federally Administrated Tribal Areas in Pakistan, and Plaintiffs note that the Federally Administered Tribal Areas ceased to exist in 2018.

With respect to Documents or Communications relating to weapons or explosives use and John Doe, Plaintiffs represent that no such Documents or Communications exist. On the basis of the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents regarding "John Doe's presence in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas in 2020 or any other year."

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, "John Doe's presence in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas in 2020 or any other year" is not relevant to any claim or defense in this litigation.

58. All Documents or Communications relating to the United States or any other foreign power in Afghanistan between September 6, 2019 and September 3, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and open to multiple interpretations to the extent it refers to "any other foreign power." Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks "[a]ll Documents or Communications relating to the United States or any other foreign power in Afghanistan[.]"

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents in response to this Request.

59. All Documents or Communications relating to Communications between September 6, 2019, and the present, between John Doe and John Doe's father, including any Communications conducted through the mobile number +93-70-378-0791; and/or the WhatsApp account associated with that number; or any other mobile telephone or WhatsApp account belonging to or used by John Doe's father.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, disproportional to the needs of the case, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks "[a]ll Documents or Communications relating to Communications between September 6, 2019, and the present, between John Doe and John Doe's father[.]" Plaintiffs object to this Request as irrelevant to the claim or defense of any party to this action and to the extent it is not proportional to the needs of the case, because there is no dispute the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

60. All Documents or Communications between July 10, 2021 and December 8, 2021 relating to a term of legal responsibility for Baby Doe, including, but not limited to, "parent," "daughter," "responsible," "guardian," "masuleyat," "sarparasti," "sarparast," "wali," etc.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, to the extent it seeks "[a]ll Documents or Communications[.]"

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce document responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

61. All Documents or Communications from September 6, 2019 to present relating to any of Bahlool's immediate relatives, including, but not limited to, Haji Mohammad Ismail, and Lal Mohammad (and alternate phonetic spellings).

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the extent it seeks information "relating to any of Bahlool's immediate relatives" and to the extent it employs vague terms such as "immediate relatives" without definition. Further, there is no dispute that the Governments of Afghanistan and the United States made a final determination to reunify Baby Doe and her biological family as determined pursuant to a familial tracing search conducted by the International Committee for the Red Cross. The sufficiency and legal effect of these determinations are not at issue in this case.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the foregoing objections, the validity of the reunification determination reached by the ICRC and honored by the governments of the United States and Afghanistan is not relevant to any party's claim or defense in this matter. Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control referring to Plaintiffs' relationship with Baby Doe.

62. All Documents or Communications relating to *Touhy* authorizations or changing orders (including, but not limited to, any drafts sent to Kathryn Wyer or any other member of the U.S. Government) for Major Mast.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications in their possession, custody, or control relating to *Touhy* requests related to Joshua Mast, to the extent such materials exist.

63. All Documents or Communications relating to canceling Baby Doe's asylum interview set for 23 January 2023.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control.

Plaintiffs state that they have no documents responsive to this request.

64. All Documents or Communications relating to the release of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense request to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for a Humanitarian Parole visa for Baby Doe, including but not limited to, the denial of Major Mast's Privacy Act to USCIS for that record.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object on the basis that the United States is a party to this litigation, so this information is more properly sought from the United States. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information not in their possession, custody or control.

On the basis of these objections Plaintiffs will not produce any documents responsive to this Request.

Supplemental Response: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will search for and produce non-privileged documents and communications relating to a release of a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Request to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for a Humanitarian Parole visa for Baby Doe, to the extent such materials exist.

65. All Documents or Communications with any current or former employee or official of any agency of the United States Government relating to Baby Doe, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, Department of Justice, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services or any other federal agency, for this proceeding or any of the above proceedings.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing classified information, immigration information not directly related to this litigation, information pertaining to ongoing law enforcement investigations, and/or personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, to the extent it seeks "[a]ll Documents or Communications[.]"

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide nonprivileged Documents and Communications within their possession, custody or control responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist.

66. All Documents or Communications produced or provided in or for the Circuit Court Matter by or from Nominal Defendants, to or from Plaintiffs or their agents, including any released pursuant to the *Touhy* process, Privacy Act, or Freedom of Information Act.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant to Defendant Richard Mast's defense on the basis that Defendant Richard Mast was not a party in the Circuit Court Matter and the issues are not identical. The Circuit Court Matter is an adoption proceeding, whereas the instant litigation is premised on the defendants' tortious conduct in depriving Plaintiffs John and Jane Doe of a continuing parental relationship of Baby Doe.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide nonprivileged Documents and Communications within their possession, custody or control, responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent permitted by orders of the court in the Circuit Court Matter and to the extent such Documents and Communications relate to the claims and defenses in this case.

67. All Documents or Communications between and among the United States Government and/or its agents, and counsel for the Plaintiffs, including any attorney or employee of Hunton Andrews Kurth, Latham & Watkins, Elbially Law PLLC, Graham Law Firm, or any advocate, including, but not limited to, Martha Jenkins, relating to any of the Plaintiffs or Defendants or their respective relatives.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it calls for Documents containing personal identifying information in violation of Protective Orders entered in this court or in the matters referenced in Defendant's definitions and instructions. Plaintiffs object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, to the extent it seeks "[a]ll Documents or Communications between and among the United States Government and/or its agents, and… any advocate, including, but not limited to, Martha Jenkins, relating to any of the Plaintiffs or Defendants or their respective relatives" and to the extent it employs vague terms like "agents," "advocates," or "relatives" without definition. Plaintiffs will interpret "agent" as "agents acting in a law enforcement capacity."

Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide nonprivileged Documents and Communications within their possession, custody or control, responsive to this Request as interpreted in the foregoing paragraph, to the extent they exist..

68. All Documents or Communications relating to any effort to bringing Baby Doe to the United States, including, but not limited to, communications from Office of the President, Office of the Vice President, between the dates September 6, 2019, and March 1, 2020; and between the dates of August 16, 2021 and August 23, 2021.

RESPONSE:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if stated fully herein. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Plaintiffs object to this Request to the extent it seeks information more readily available to Defendant than Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs would only have access to these Documents or Communications through discovery in the Circuit Court Matter, whereas Plaintiffs understanding is that these Documents and Communications were authored by Defendant.

On the basis of these objections, Plaintiffs will not produce any Documents in response to this Request.

Supplemental Response: To clarify the forgoing objections, the request appears to seek documents and communications that, to Plaintiffs' best understanding, were sent or received by Defendants and not Plaintiffs. Requiring Plaintiffs to produce back to Defendants something that is already in their possession is unduly burdensome and not proportional to the needs of the case.

Dated: April 26, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Kevin S. Elliker*
Maya M. Eckstein (VSB No. 41413)
Lewis F. Powell III (VSB No. 18266)
Kevin S. Elliker (VSB No. 87498)
HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP
951 E Byrd St
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone: (804) 788-8200
Fax: (804) 788-8218
Email: meckstein@HuntonAK.com
Email: lpowell@HuntonAK.com
Email: kelliker@HuntonAK.com

Jeremy C. King (*admitted pro hac vice*)
HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
Telephone: (212) 309-1000
Fax: (212) 309-1100
Email: jking@HuntonAK.com

Sehla Ashai (*admitted pro hac vice*)
ELBIALLY LAW, PLLC
704 East 15th Street
Suite 204
Plano, TX 75074
Telephone: (312) 659-0154
Email: ashai@elbiallylaw.com

Blair Connelly (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Zachary Rowen (*admitted pro hac vice*)
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
1271 Avenue of the Americans
New York, NY 10029
Telephone: (212) 906-1200
Email: blair.connelly@lw.com
Email: Zachary.rowen@lw.com

Damon Porter (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Ehson Kashfipour (*admitted pro hac vice*)
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004-1304
Telephone: (202) 637-2001
Email: damon.porter@lw.com
Email: ehson.kashfipour@lw.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 26th day of April, I electronically mailed the foregoing to all counsel of record in this case.

/s/ *Kevin S. Elliker*
Kevin S. Elliker (VSB No. 87498)
HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP
951 E Byrd St
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone: (804) 788-8200
Fax: (804) 788-8218
Email: meckstein@HuntonAK.com